

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
OTERO HALL, TUBAC PRESIDIO STATE HISTORIC PARK
ONE BURREL STREET, TUBAC, AZ
MARCH 17, 2005
MINUTES**

Board Members Present:

Elizabeth Stewart, Chairman
William Porter
Janice Chilton
John Hays

Board Members Absent:

William Cordasco
William Scalzo
Mark Winkleman

Staff Present:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administration
Cristie Statler, Executive Consultant
Dan Shein, Chief, Resources Management
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary

Attorney General's Office:

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Chairman Stewart called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. She announced that Mr. Beechum has resigned from the Board so that he can devote his time to his new duties as the Parks and Recreation Director at Florence. He has been replaced by Bill Scalzo, Director, Maricopa County Parks and Recreation. Unfortunately, Mr. Scalzo is unable to be present today because he had a prior commitment out-of-town.

B. WELCOMING REMARKS

Mr. Joe Martinez, Park Manager, Tubac Presidio State Historic Park welcomed the Board to Arizona's first state park. He introduced the park staff: Brian Abad, Assistant Park Manager; Victor Valenzuela, Ground Facility Manager; Terry Leverton, Interpreter Ranger (who was off).

Mr. Martinez noted that the park has changed quite a bit. The park is the site of the Presidio that was established in 1752 to protect the missions that were in the area. Arizona State Parks (ASP) received this property as a gift in 1958 and established the Presidio as a state park in 1963. He noted that his father was the second or third ranger hired to work at the park. He grew up on the park. Changes to the park include the addition of Presidio Drive, the addition of a wall to enforce the fee area, and sidewalks have been installed throughout the park to make it a user-friendlier park. The public have received these changes well. Mr. Freisinger, Ms. Murphy, and Ms. Buchmann did a wonderful job re-doing the museum, and the park staff did a lot of work on it as well. They were the recipients of the Team of the Year Award at the TTC this year. He noted that staff would be available after the meeting to provide a tour of the park.

Chairman Stewart asked how many people visit the park and what three things someone visiting the park should look at.

Mr. Martinez responded that visitation is about 19,000. He believes the park was hurt by the fact that the park was closed a few years ago and word has not gotten out that the park is open again. They still see articles that say the park is closed. Staff are trying to make contact with various magazines to let them know the park is open.

Mr. Martinez stated that he would tell people to see the schoolhouse. A lot of people who come to the park have family who were in Tubac and either went to school here or were baptized or married in the church. A lot of the visitors really enjoy the museum because of the new exhibits. One of the biggest remarks he used to get was that the park hadn't changed a bit in 10 years. Now they remark that they were here 5 years ago and the place really looks different – much nicer. He believes that's a big plus. The museum is really nice. They are getting great reviews on it.

Chairman Stewart noted that she had a quick tour yesterday. In the four years that she's been on the Board she has stopped at this park at least a dozen times. This is the most dramatic improvement of any park that she's seen during her tenure on the Board. She believes that Mr. Martinez and his entire staff are to be complimented. Since he's taken over as Manager, a lot has happened; there's been help, but he's the one who made it happen.

Mr. Martinez thanked the Board and the agency for supporting the park and providing the funding to get everything done.

Mr. John Maynard, Board of Supervisors, Santa Cruz County, addressed the Board. He welcomed the Board to Santa Cruz County and stated that while it may be one of Arizona's smaller counties, it is definitely one of the grandest. They are very happy that the Board is here today. They are very enthused that the Board took time yesterday to take a look at the Santa Cruz River. The riparian habitat is a keystone in the county's newly-adopted comprehensive plan. They recognize the value of that habitat as being the backbone of this part of the county. Earlier this month they unanimously passed a Resolution supporting the eventual creation of the river park. They are very aware that, like them, the Board does not have the resources or the assets to do it alone. However, they are looking at ASP as the keystone – the arch – of partnerships that will hopefully take a step forward. They recognize the value of partnerships and believe there are some great opportunities that will present themselves this year for a number of other partners to fall in place and support this venture. They will do everything they can to ensure that they are responsive in some way and a partner as well. On behalf of himself and the other members of the Board of Supervisors, he welcomed the Board to Tubac. They are glad the Board is here and appreciate the Board taking time to look at the community as well.

The Board and staff then introduced themselves to the audience.

C. CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Approve Minutes of February 17, 2005 State Parks Board Meeting**
- 2. Consider Withdrawal of Cochise County Historical Society Historic Preservation Fund Project #649807 – Old Pearce Store Stabilization** - Staff recommends the withdrawal of Cochise County Historical Society Historic Preservation Fund Project #649807, Old Pearce Store. The balance of funds, \$10,413.94 will be returned to the Historic Preservation Fund.
- 3. Consider Request for Retroactive Extension of the Project End Date for Episcopal Community Services Historic Preservation Fund Project #640012 – Trinity Cathedral** – Staff recommends the approval of a one-year retroactive project end date of November 7, 2004 to November 7, 2005 for Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640012, the Episcopal Community Services for the Trinity Cathedral Restoration project. HPAC unanimously approved a two-year retroactive time extension to Trinity Cathedral on February 7, 2005.
- 4. Consider Request for Retroactive Extension of the Project End date for Old Pueblo Trolley,**

Inc. – Historic Preservation Fund Project #649910n – Historic Bus Restoration – Staff recommends the approval of a one-year retroactive project end date of November 19, 2004 to November 19, 2005 to the Old Pueblo Trolley, Inc. for the Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #649910, Historic Bus Restoration project. HPAC unanimously approved the retroactive one-year time extension on February 7, 2005.

5. **Consider Request for Retroactive Extension of the Project End Date for Town of Prescott Valley Historic Preservation Fund Project #640106 – Barlow-Massicks House Stabilization** – Staff recommends the approval of a one-year retroactive project end date of November 6, 2004 to November 6, 2005 to the Town of Prescott Valley for the Historic Preservation Heritage Fund #640106, Barlow-Massicks House Stabilization project. HPAC unanimously approved this retroactive one-year time extension on February 7, 2005.
6. **Consider Extending the Project End Date for the Mohave County State Lake Improvement Fund Project #780114, Willow Beach Fishing Pier** – Staff recommends extending the project end day by 24 months to January 29, 2007 for the Mohave County /NPS State Lake Improvement Fund Project #780114, Willow Beach Fishing Pier. AORCC unanimously concurred with the staff recommendation at the February 10, 2005 meeting.

Mr. Porter made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Stewart expressed concern that there were a lot of retroactive approvals. There is probably a need to ensure that when there is a turnover in staff, which is common in state government given the salaries paid, that there are procedures in place to avoid this happening again in the future.

Mr. Travous responded that he will address this issue with staff next week.

D. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES – The Board and staff may discuss and the Board may take action on the following, if requested by the Board:

1. PAMS Update

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board received materials in their packets indicating where things stand on this project.

Mr. Porter complimented staff on the information provided. It answered virtually every question he had. He likes the direction it is going.

Mr. Ream reported that the grant opportunity is no longer available based on eligibility requirements. He noted that this is an exciting and dynamic group to work with. There is no one in charge. Right now it is more of a hardware/computer driven group and not so much a programming/software driven group although they all meet together. It is currently being led by Ms. Christy Garza, who is setting up all the hardware. Ms. Tanna Thornberg is on the software/documentation side. Putting the report together was a compilation between Ms. Garza and Ms. Thornberg. He noted there is a website available that is a sample of what will happen with PAMS and what it might look like when it's done. There has been some work done at Lost Dutchman State Park. He can provide that web address to anyone who is interested.

Chairman Stewart stated that it is important to keep in mind that this is a tool to implement the new Vision – To be recognized as the best resource management agency. In order to have that credibility and respect to be so recognized, decisions have to be based on scientific data and on a factual basis. PAMS is the tool to make this information available agency-wide in order to be able to make those decisions on a more factual basis as the system grows. We can't rely as much on people's "gut feeling", even though we have staff who have been around for a long time and have good instincts. She asked when the Board will receive the timeline for implementation of PAMS.

Mr. Ream responded it may be available at the next quarterly update. It's not that they aren't working hard – it's that a Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) has just been designed for a new Manager position for this project. It will be someone who will carry the ball beyond this committee that is working on it now. At this time, it appears that the project is leaning toward the hardware side. The project is still in the early stages. Staff will try to provide a timeline in the next quarter.

Mr. Porter noted that the Board is putting the agency through a tremendous amount of change; probably more than may have happened since it was founded. With that in mind, he noted that it is probably placing a lot of stress on the agency and, particularly, the Executive Staff. He asked if Executive Staff are feeling overstretched. He expected that it would have such an impact and asked if that is the case.

Mr. Travous responded that it has raised some questions for him. We get so entrenched in how we do things because we have done them for so long that when something new is begun some very basic questions are asked. Staff are trying to ensure that they are not only doing those things they need to do, but must now ask if they are measuring the right things. He wouldn't call it stress as much as he would call it confusion. Everyone is dedicated to this project and wants to do it.

Mr. Porter asked what the Board can do to help move the project forward. It has been more than a year now, and it's probably time for the Board to look at where they fit into this picture.

Mr. Travous responded that the Board's continued patience and understanding is appreciated. Things have come up that staff did not realize would come up. As we go into strategic planning that would be a good time to talk about where we want to go. There may be some foundational things that will need to change. Today's discussions and the discussions in the next two meetings will be key. It will be important to have all the Board present at the next two meetings.

Chairman Stewart stated that there is a difference between implementing PAMS and implementing the Vision. The Board would like to have a report at the next meeting on where things stand in implementing the Vision – what, if anything, has been done in terms of implementing it and whether there are any changes actually occurring at the agency as a result of it.

2. Capital budget, Heritage Fund Distribution, and NPS Apportionment (for LWCF) by Fiscal Year

Mr. Travous reported that the Board received a graph detailing what has occurred with the General Fund over the years at the last Board meeting. He asked the Board to keep that graph handy and to add the graphs in this Board packet to it because they provide a full picture of where we are from a financial standpoint. They are staff's best efforts to show the Board what has happened.

Mr. Travous referred to the graph on page 24 of the Board packet. This graph reflects the amount of money from state funding sources the agency received since 1957. He noted that some things happened from 1983-85 (when Bruce Babbitt was Governor) that caused an infusion of money. Then it dropped. Then we hit a "Golden Era" when the agency had money from a variety of places to do a lot of things with. During 2004-2005, in essence, the only capital money the agency is getting is from the Heritage Fund. That is the only pot available to the agency. There are restrictions. There is acquisition money for natural areas only; there is capital and acquisition money (\$1.7 million), most of which is geared for taking care of major problems (maintenance of infrastructure, water treatment systems, law enforcement, etc.) He noted that he met with the Tubac Society yesterday. They are concerned about the arroyo flooding. Because of the development that is going on and the increase in runoff, it floods the Old Barrio out. Five years ago he could have told them the agency would take \$50,000 and re-channel the arroyo to protect all of the archeological sites. However, it would be a scramble now to try to find that \$50,000.

Chairman Stewart noted that there was a statement that the chart reflects the amount of money from

state funding sources. She asked if there is any significant non-state funding other than the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF).

Mr. Travous responded that the only other funding is from LWCF.

Mr. Travous referred to page 27 of the packet. This chart reflects the Heritage Fund distribution. The Heritage Fund that the agency receives is earmarked for certain things.

Mr. Travous referred to page 29 of the packet. This chart reflects the National Parks Service (NPS) apportionment for LWCF. He has been involved in this program for more than 20 years. From 1995-1998 the stateside received nothing. By agreement with AORCC, the agency receives 30% of this funding for its own purposes with the remainder being used for grants based upon the same guidelines used for the Heritage Fund. He noted that in 2001 there was more than \$2.5 million in that fund, with more than \$800,000 available to the agency for 19 grants. Beyond that, there is a 10% surcharge on the grant money for administration of funds by the agency. As that fund goes down, there will be no administrative funds. For 2005, the President just made his budget request suggesting \$0 for stateside LWCF. Mr. Travous has called Senator McCain's office to see if he can support an amendment to the Resolution to put the money back in. He has not heard back yet whether that money was put back in or not. They are trying to get it back to the point where Arizona would receive \$1.4-\$1.5 million. The worst case scenario is that there may be no money in that fund.

Chairman Stewart noted that, as reflected in the chart, during her tenure on the Board since 2001 (the peak), it has been downhill ever since as far as money is concerned. The Board has reached a point where there is much more money for acquisition and capital given away in grants than is available to use in its own parks. The fund raids on the agency's budget have resulted in the need to take most of the money earmarked for capital and use it for operating expenses.

Mr. Travous referred to page 31 of the packet. This chart reflects a "madhouse scheme". The Capital chart reflects that back in the late 1990s the various funds were doing a number of things. LWCF, as discussed, was going to three areas of the agency. The General Fund was going to Park Operations and Administration; that has been reduced to the point where 75% of that square can be erased. The Enhancement Fund Operating is still going to Park Development. The Enhancement Fund Development is no longer supporting Park Development; it is now going strictly to Park Operations. When it was going to Park Development, money was being generated and going back into the fund because people were coming to the parks and spending money and that money went back into the Enhancement Fund and the Operating Fund. That has been cut off because it is all going into Operations now. The State Lake Improvement Fund (SLIF) was going for Partners, Operations, and Administration; that money is now all going for Operations. If money is spent right away for operations and not sitting in the bank for two years during development, little interest is earned. It has a snowball effect.

Mr. Travous noted that the agency is playing a different ballgame now. He wanted the Board to have that financial background as strategic planning is discussed. He reiterated that we can't not look at this; we have to pay attention to it as we go forward. He asked that the Board keep these charts together and available to them. They may come in handy.

Chairman Stewart then moved to Agenda Item E.2.

E. DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. Acquisition Priorities

Chairman Stewart noted that there are two fold-out charts in the Board packet (pages 32-33) that list all of the properties staff believe the Board should have. After listening to Mr. Travous' presentation on what is in the "piggy bank", it is not as much fun as going into the candy store with a full wallet.

Mr. Dan Shein, Chief, Resources Management, began his presentation. He thanked the Resources Management staff for putting these charts together; it was a group effort. Rather than focus on the individual boxes, he would try to give the Board a framework on how the matrix was structured. The land staff (Mr. Eatherly and Mr. Warriner) went through the records, as well as their memories, regarding the properties that are out there where people have come to the agency and asked if ASP might be interested in purchasing them. Properties are listed with both natural area value as well as those that are not eligible for Natural Areas funding. The Natural Areas fund currently has about a \$4.7 million balance. When the Lottery contributes the full \$10 million a year, then that fund receives \$1.7 million to be used for acquisition of natural areas.

Ms. Stewart asked if the \$4.7 million currently in the fund is from earlier years that the Board has allowed to build up.

Mr. Shein responded affirmatively.

Mr. Shein explained that the other categories found on the chart were the result of brainstorming on the part of staff. Of importance are Location, County, Acreage Size, and parks near the properties or that the properties are a part of. The Comments column gives a feel for the type of property (natural, inholdings, linkages, etc.). They are a number of factors to consider when evaluating properties for acquisition. He noted that there are a few properties that are leased from the State Land Department (SLD). The issue related to leases is that a percentage of the appraised value is being paid. The question is should the Board continue to make those payments or should the Board consider taking the parcel by acquiring it outright rather than spending the money on lease payments and freeing that money up for operations, inventory, etc., in the park. There are not that many properties that are leased.

Chairman Stewart asked whether there is also the possibility that those leased properties could be sold out from under the Board. There are no 99-year leases on these properties.

Mr. Shein responded affirmatively. The leases could come up for sale. Another concern is who else might be interested in those properties. It is a factor to be considered. Another concern is that if it's a SLD lease, then in addition to ASP having to sign-off on activities, SLD would also have to signoff on those activities as well. He gave an example of archaeology work at Homolovi State Park by the field school at the University of Michigan. They will have to have SLD sign-off on the work as well as ASP because the parcel is a SLD lease.

Mr. Shein noted that there are Wastewater and Water Rights issues that are important. There are descriptions in that column about those items. A lot of the properties have Phase I Environment Assessment (the basic Environmental Assessment) and they are reflected in the T&E/Environmental column. There are also some notes about whether there are any particular species that might be found on the property. Management needs are reflected, as are Cultural activities (archaeological and historic surveys and inventories). Management is an overarching issue. A property can be acquired; once it is acquired, there are issues of cost over time to operate and maintain it in terms of staffing, infrastructure, tracking natural resources in the area, etc. The acquisition costs may be relatively small in comparison to the cost over time to operate it.

Mr. Shein referred to Development and Trails issues. This column refers to where the property is, whether it protects the view shed of a park. The Connectivity/Vicinity column discusses whether it allows for connectivity between existing ASP facilities. The last column, Potential Land Appreciation, rates the property by pluses (+) or equal signs (=). The more + signs means the more that property will appreciate over time. When making an acquisition evaluation, the Board may look at that column and if the property will appreciate a lot over the next few years, it may change where the Board puts it in priority. The Board may look at a number of properties and determine which properties it really has to have, which it would be nice to have, and which properties it would be

OK to have. If there is a property in the high potential land appreciation category, it means that the longer the Board waits to acquire it the more it will cost over time. If there is a property with only one + or an =, it will be somewhat less expensive over time. The Board may be able to wait without it costing that much more down the road.

Chairman Stewart asked on what basis those determinations were made.

Mr. Shein responded that Mr. Warriner is the Acquisitions staff person and he is also an appraiser. He has a lot of experience in that area. He researched the types of properties on the list and what was going on in that particular market and made the determination about the land appreciation values. He watched what has happened historically. Some of the properties, for example, on Dead Horse and the Verde Greenway, are appreciating rather rapidly. They are probably in the highest category. There is also one BLM property adjacent to Contact Point in Lake Havasu City that is appreciating fairly rapidly. This would be another factor in making a decision on acquisition.

Mr. Shein stated that he is trying to point out that there is a variety of categories on these charts where the Board can weigh where properties would fall on a scale to determine how it wants to make an acquisition. There is no natural answer for any one item. There are a number of factors to consider, such as whether it's an inholding, a potential for high land appreciation, whether it completes an existing project, whether it provides connectivity between existing parks, and whether there are important natural and cultural resources on the properties.

Chairman Stewart stated that she felt this document is very helpful. It is a dramatic improvement over the last chart. It contains a lot of information. She felt one more column would be helpful to tie the information together – Why it is important to acquire this property. Sometimes it is obvious; sometimes it's not obvious to the Board. Staff have a lot more information than the Board that the Board does not necessarily want. Why a property is important to acquire is a critical issue. For example, why is the State Trust Land that is part of an existing park or adjacent to an existing park important. That information, along with the other information, can help the Board determine how important a property is.

Mr. Porter suggested that eventually it needs to be prioritized. There are roughly 18,000 acres set forth in this list. Obviously, some are far more critical than others. He also believes that a factor in prioritizing may be the practicality of the acquisition. There probably are properties that the Board knows are a high priority but the Board also knows that the likelihood of its being able to acquire them in the near future is, for whatever reason, almost nonexistent (excessive cost or some other obstacle). Eventually these properties need to be prioritized and a "hit list" created of the top priorities that are also practical, meaning there is a significant or reasonable likelihood of achieving acquisition. The Board knows that the money will be very, very scarce. The Board will have to make its dollars bang as much as they can.

Mr. Ream stated that there are some properties that are specifically excluded from this list for the reason that staff do not want to put them on a list that is made public. There are properties in Arizona staff don't know are available yet that may be very desirable in the future. The properties that appear on this list are closer and adjacent to something the agency already does. He noted that the extension of the Verde River Greenway to the Salt River does not appear on this list.

Chairman Stewart noted that, since joining the Board and having visited all 30 parks, it struck her that almost every park has a major issue of open space adjacent to the park or land that the Board leases. If the present use were to change, the park as we know it today would be greatly diminished or even, in some cases, destroyed. She considers a high priority to be looking at ways to protect those State Trust lands the Board leases that are part of the parks and to protect those that the parks rely on for view sheds and buffers, etc. She feels the Board needs to pay particular attention to a combination of things. Some may be those the Board tries to acquire outright; some may be those that the Board

tries to get long-term leases tied up on. The BLM land might be eligible for one of the sweetheart leases given to government for \$1 year if it's for recreation and public purposes. She believes that the Board must come to the reality that three or four years ago it looked promising to get some of the State Trust lands free as part of a reform of the Constitutional provisions regarding the State Land Trust. It's becoming more and more obvious that it is highly unlikely there will be anything for free. There may be some things the Board can get without going to auction. It will not be everything the agency needs. If the Board sits around and waits until there is some kind of initiative or referendum, the point may have been reached where it is no longer possible to secure some of those properties. She feels it is important that the Board takes care of what it already has.

Mr. Porter stated that he fully understands what staff is saying about properties out there that are not listed; that in many cases they may be potentially new parks or extensions to existing parks. He has no problem with that, except that the question comes to mind as to how the Board will pay for them. He believes that this list needs to eventually be prioritized because it helps the Board to then go to partners, many of who are tremendously impacted on the local level by some of these parks, with properties that the Board identified as potentially critical to get them to understand that the Board cannot do it alone. The Board will not have the funds available to do it alone. They may need to begin looking at fundraising on their level, whether it be through assistance from local governments or local fundraising. It also lets the Board take its priorities to the Foundation and request that they fundraise particularly for those projects. It may enable the Board to impact the priority items and begin to knock some of the more critical items off the list. He wishes the Board could do them all.

Mr. Porter added that he agreed a column listing the importance or reasons for acquisition will help the Board make decisions on acquisition is needed. Once the list is reviewed for prioritization, some of these properties may begin to glow red and help the Board and agency decide in what direction to push.

Chairman Stewart suggested that another column dealing with problems in terms of acquisition or management once acquired needs to be added so that the Board is not just looking at the upside.

Mr. Hays asked whether discussions of prioritization of acquisitions can be done in Executive Session. If these discussions are held in public session, the Board will be giving away its hand. A property owner simply needs to read this list and jack the price up.

Ms. Hernbrode responded that her initial inclination is that it cannot be done in Executive Session. There is an Executive Session provision for purchases designed to determine how much the Board is willing to pay for a particular property.

Chairman Stewart stated that she doubted the Board could talk about this entire list in Executive Session. She doesn't believe the Board is at that point yet. She believes the Board could discuss individual properties if it is in negotiations on them.

Mr. Ream suggested an additional column relating to Potential Funding. He noted that there are limitations on some funding sources. Some acquisitions may involve a combination of funding sources. There is money in the Natural Areas fund because of the limitations in funding that fund. Because there are fewer limitations on Acquisitions and Development in the Heritage Fund, that money is going almost entirely on development right now. Some of these properties have been reviewed by the Natural Areas committee and have been found to have natural areas potential. The Picket Post House, near Boyce Thompson Arboretum, is not a natural area; however, if the price came down tomorrow the question would be what kind of scrambling could be done to secure that property for the State of Arizona. That part of the strategy needs to be added to the list. At the current asking price, staff would not scramble that hard; however, if they dropped it \$1 million then staff may look for ways to purchase it.

Mr. Porter noted that this list is somewhat prioritized. The Board can recognize when a property becomes feasible and whether it needs to be accomplished as opposed to those things that staff are already working on. The Board can determine whether it wants to pursue an acquisition but desperately needs to accomplish other acquisitions as higher levels of priority. It may make things easier for the Board to react with the additional columns added to the list.

Mr. Hays noted that Senator Hart organized an appropriations trip to the Picket Post House some 25 years ago. The price on that property doubled after their visit. Every time the Board talks about really liking a property, that scenario will probably happen. He would prefer not having a public record of what the Board really wants.

Chairman Stewart noted that there is the provision for Executive Session during negotiations and instructing its representatives regarding purchase, sale, or lease in public session. She doesn't believe the Board is ready at this time. In the meantime, she requested that the Assistant Attorney General consult with OMLET (Open Meeting Law Enforcement Team). Because the Board is in negotiations on the Rio Rico properties, the Board can go into Executive Session to give instructions to its representatives on that specific property. In terms of the entire list, she is not comfortable doing that today without OMLET saying it is OK. She believes that provision of the law is limited to negotiations.

Mr. Hays requested that the question be asked for future reference.

Ms. Hernbrode stated that she will investigate the question. In reading the language of the statute, it does appear that the Board needs to actually be in negotiations for purchase of property before going into Executive Session. She will take the question to OMLET.

Chairman Stewart asked staff whether the additional information can be incorporated onto the list for the next Board meeting.

Mr. Shein responded that staff would try.

Chairman Stewart noted that staff have already compiled the more difficult information and probably know the answers.

Mr. Shein agreed that the bulk of the work has been done. More discussion and refining is necessary to accomplish the Board's request.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Shein has not been formally introduced to the Board. He has replaced Ms. Emery as Chief of Natural Resources. She asked Mr. Shein to discuss his prior experience to give the Board perspective on his background.

Mr. Shein responded that he spent a lot of his career with the Arizona State Legislature. He was a staff person in the Arizona House for the Natural Resources and Environment committees. After serving with the legislature from 1977-1980 he went with what is now known as the Department of Commerce, the state Energy office, and then with the League of Women Voters as their legislative liaison. In 1986 he returned to the legislature and retired in 2002. He then began volunteering with the NPS. In November 2004 he came on staff at ASP as Chief of Resources Management.

Mr. Hays noted that during his years with the legislature, Mr. Shein was considered the most knowledgeable person on natural resource issues. He believes the agency is very fortunate that he is on staff. He was also considered the best diplomat to work with the legislature.

Mr. Travous added that it was Mr. Shein and one other person on legislative staff who put together the "secret" way of obtaining Kartchner Caverns.

Chairman Stewart noted that next month the Board will tour the Verde River Greenway to see some properties in that area. Yesterday the Board had the opportunity to tour the Rio Rico properties. Mr.

Tobin, Rio Rico Properties, is present and wishes to speak to the Board.

Mr. Tobin addressed the Board. He stated that he wanted to reiterate Mr. Maynard's comments this morning about pushing to make the project happen. They respect the challenges that the Board faces in regard to budget crunches. He presented a map of the project and pointed out the greenway of the Santa Cruz River as envisioned. He reminded the Board that their concept is that ASP would acquire the river and that a portion of the Sonoita Creek Natural Area would be donated by Rio Rico Properties as part of the larger package. He also wanted to let the Board know that Rio Rico Properties has recently been approached by the Trust for Public Land and the Sonoran Institute who want to help bring this project to reality. He heard the Board's comments regarding partnerships and believes it is happening. There will be a meeting with these groups in the near future that will include staff. They would like to explore some sources for funding. In addition, Rio Rico Properties' concept of this project includes something similar to what was done on Sonoita Creek in terms of trying to create funding for ongoing management after Close of Escrow. Both of the above-mentioned organizations have indicated that they want to explore creation of long-term funding sources for the management portion of the property along with a community stewardship organization. They are excited about that concept. It may become a part of this as well as the set-aside that is already on the table. He thanked the Board for its time. He knows they are facing challenges; they believe this is a special project that could become something that could tie not just the Rio Rico portion but also Tubac, the Anza Trail, Sonoita Creek Natural Area, etc. They are excited about the possibilities of bringing the project to reality.

Ms. Sherry L. Sass, Friends of the Santa Cruz River, addressed the Board. She noted that they are a volunteer group that, for more than a decade, has tried to protect the habitat of the Santa Cruz River. They fully recognize that there are major issues with water and management that need to be clearly resolved. She has visited parks in other states where the good parks showcase the natural resources that make those states special. ASP does that, too. She believes that Southern Arizona is thrilled about the Sonoita Creek development and that it goes a long way to protect some of the riparian resources that, to her mind, really defines Southern Arizona as a very special area. While the biology of the area is her leaning, the cultural connections are important as well. The Rio Rico potential is phenomenal. That habitat not only already has significant value for its species (top minnow, cuckoo, and other rare and threatened species) that depend on that habitat, the potential is even greater. Once the cattle are gone, she believes it will be almost unrecognizable. The wide diversity of the native species in this area along the river is unparalleled. She hopes that the issues involved with this project can be resolved and that the Board will put all of the resources of the state behind resolving all those issues and focus on acquiring some of this very valuable habitat. She believes that the payoff will be huge. As has been mentioned, there are a lot of partners out there who are very eager to help, not only with the acquisition but with management. She understands that ASP's resources are limited, but the help will come. This area is eager to support such a park. She asked that the Board keep an open mind and remember what a world-class habitat this is.

Chairman Stewart stated that one of things that the Board needs to think about is that there are ways to make things happen without the Board being the one that does it. The Board can enable others to do something; or the Board can try to do it with partners. Right now it looks like there is a lot more grant money available for someone else to do it. There is \$3.5 million in the Heritage Fund that can be awarded in grants for these kinds of projects to counties or cities. The Board will probably receive similar amounts each year. There is more money in the foreseeable future to give away than for the Board to acquire it. If the money is given away in a grant, the Board cannot then turn around an own it. That would be a violation of the Heritage Fund. It is something to think about. Perhaps the Board should take a more active role in getting other entities in a position to do things.

Chairman Stewart stated that Acquisitions Priorities will continue as an Agenda Item for the April

meeting. It is a major decision and not something the Board wants to decide over night. There are ongoing discussions with Rio Rico, people in the Verde Valley, State Trust Land, and individual properties elsewhere.

D. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES

3. Legislative Update

Mr. Travous reported that he requested Mr. Ziemann remain in Phoenix to track what is occurring at the legislature.

Mr. Travous reported that this morning the legislative leadership passed a state budget that does not include the Governor's all-day kindergarten request for \$25 million. There are issues on the Senate side regarding things that are and are not included in this bill. It is not something that will be decided quickly. The Governor then has to decide whether or not she will approve the budget once it comes to her desk.

Mr. Travous noted that HB 2180 – Spur Cross Ranch – is a technical bill that is slowly percolating through the Senate. It continues to be a technical bill. Testimony will be taken Friday.

Mr. Travous reported that SB 1459 – River Reservoir Repair – talks about using \$750,000 of SLIF for dam repairs. Mr. Ziemann is watching that bill closely. It has not been dropped. If it is, that \$750,000 will represent 1/4 of all the grant money the Board would be able to give out in SLIF grants this year. People in Lake Havasu have been contacted to let them know what is going on so that they can be effective in calling their elected representatives. People in Lake Havasu are very interested in SLIF.

Mr. Porter noted that it needs to be brought to Senator Gould's attention that here is yet another opportunity for the state to grant some of the things he was complaining about impacting Lake Havasu City.

Chairman Stewart asked if there is any indication that they would be taking the Board's operating share or if it would be grant money.

Mr. Travous responded that it appears to be grant money.

Chairman Stewart asked if this is the same amount they swept before.

Mr. Travous responded that in the past they have swept all of the money. They would be leaving all but \$750,000. The Board would still receive its portion for operating.

Mr. Hays asked if the legislature no longer holds subcommittee hearings on the budget and if leadership does it all now.

Mr. Travous responded that there are no subcommittees and no input from affected parties. The people the Board would discuss bills with, like Representative O'Halleran, are not on the Appropriations Committee. The people who study and try to understand the organization and its needs are not those who appropriate the money to those agencies.

Mr. Hays asked if there is any active opposition or outrage to this new system.

Mr. Travous responded that if there is opposition, then those who oppose the system are removed from authority.

Chairman Stewart noted that the hearings the Board attended earlier this year did not include discussion of anything of substance; they did not want to hear from the Board.

Mr. Hays noted that he had assumed they had had subcommittee hearings beforehand.

Mr. Travous responded that in the past there were subcommittee chairmen staff could talk with. That is not the case this year.

Mr. Travous reported that SB 1067 – Water Rights Settlement Appropriation – would take money from the General Fund and Game & Fish Heritage Fund in the amount of \$1.6 million. The Governor has stated she would veto that bill if it came to her desk.

Mr. Travous reported that SB 1334 – Hydrologic Studies; Benson Subwatershed – is likely dead. There is money in the Water Resources budget to account for the studies.

Mr. Travous reported that HB 2440 – Lottery Distributions – is dead.

Mr. Travous reported that it appears that all State Land Trust reform bills are dead.

Mr. Porter stated that he believes beginning next year the agency should take a very active interest in trying to get a State Archives building bill passed. He noticed that, once again, that funding bill has been killed. It is vital and does impact the Board because eventually there will be a need for the agency to be involved in archiving. The Board has an interest in an active, effective archive system in Arizona. It is currently a disaster. Thousands of valuable archives are being destroyed every year through mold, water, and heat damage because the current facility is absolutely inadequate. The new building was approved by the legislature and the plans were put together, but year after year for the last four or five years they have denied funding. Every year that they do not fund it, the state is losing that many more cubic feet of important records. He would like to see the agency's lobbying efforts include, whenever possible, making it known that the Board regards it as a very important part of its overall picture. Since the Board has historic properties, it has an interest in how the archival process is being done in Arizona. Right now it is a disaster; it is shameful.

Mr. Travous noted that Ms. Gladys Ann Wells oversees that agency. She commented to him that Mr. Ziemann has been very helpful to her over the last year or so. He noted that they do not have a lobbyist.

Chairman Stewart suggested that it may be important for the Board to have a resolution in support of the Archives.

Mr. Porter suggested that Mr. Ziemann should be made aware of the Board's concern and given a free leash to consider it an element of what the Board wants to see go through for its interests as well as theirs. It is becoming a source of real irritation because it is a disaster.

Mr. Travous asked that any resolution the Board may make be sensitive to the fact they tore down a historic building in order to build the new Archives building. SHPO was not happy about that. All they have done so far is tear down a historic building.

E. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. History Convention Update

Mr. Porter reported that the Convention is coming together extremely well. He suggested that anyone who has not received registration materials but is interested in attending the Convention needs to arrange for rooms very quickly. He noted that because Mr. Travous will be speaking at the Convention, they will pickup his registration. They will pick up the registration for the other speakers (Mr. Garrison), as well. The Plenary Session looks good. Mr. Garrison will team with Mr. Winkleman and Dr. Jack August (History Foundation). It should be an excellent presentation. Registrations are pouring in. They already have a record number of pre-registrations.

Mr. Porter noted that an invitation was extended to the President and Executive Committee of the Arizona Historical Society (AHS) to consider meeting jointly with this Board for the last 30 minutes of the Board's meeting in Flagstaff in April. They will begin their board meeting an hour-and-a-half after the Parks Board adjourns its meeting. It would be an ideal time to discuss common issues. Their board will meet tomorrow in Yuma and discuss the invitation.

Mr. Travous suggested inviting Beverly and Duane Miller to the reception. They were both so involved in preservation. It would be nice to recognize them.

Mr. Porter noted that it appears there will be a good turnout for the reception. It appears that between 200-250 people are planning to attend. He stated that Mr. Travous has personally contributed out of his pocket the wine for that reception. It was a nice gesture and is appreciated. He thanked him for that donation.

Chairman Stewart noted that it will go a long way toward improving the quality of the offering at the reception. The Convention committee was able to come up with some funds, but this donation allows them to buy fancier food.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Bill Collins, SHPO, has written a book on the history of Phoenix. He will be a speaker at one of the pre-conference events. She suggested having a book signing some time during the day of the reception.

Mr. Porter noted that there is an area set aside for the book vendors. He felt that arrangements could be made for Mr. Collins to have a table and set up a time for him to have a book signing.

Chairman Stewart suggested that this is an extraordinary opportunity to do two things. Last year the agency had a table in the vendors' area. It is important to have one again this year to let people know about the state parks. Many people came up to her last year and said they didn't realize certain facilities were state parks or asked where other state parks are located. They asked if there were other cabins besides those at Roper. She stayed at a cabin and a lot of people wanted to peek inside.

Mr. Porter stated that he did not know whether the vendors' area has already sold out. If it has, then he suggested setting up near the registration area.

Chairman Stewart added that the agency needs to have a table for selling its books there, too. There are some books that are not available elsewhere. She will provide Mr. Porter with a list of things she would like to see at the Convention and he will get it done.

Chairman Stewart noted that people buy a lot of books. Many people will spend \$300-\$400 on books. While the registration is cheap, people drop a lot of money on books. The agency has a lot of historic maps; there are books about our various historic parks that people would buy. It is important to have a lot of inventory available. In discussions with staff, it appears there is a cash flow problem with the gift shops. She believes staff should do whatever they need to do to make sure that that inventory is at this event. This is an opportunity not only to educate people about what is being done at the parks, but also to make some money.

Mr. Porter noted that the commercial book dealers have used this convention for years to move those things they are trying to move as well as to move inventory they haven't been able to move in the past. It is a great time to have that inventory there. It is a win/win for ASP. There is also an amount of discussion that goes on among the vendors themselves. They may see things the agency has that they might be able to sell. There is an amount of camaraderie and coordination that goes on.

Mr. Porter noted that the 300-400 people who come to this convention are the prime people who would have an interest in a big chunk of what we have at state parks. They don't know about a fair amount of it. It is a showcase opportunity.

Chairman Stewart noted that there will be a need to have someone at the table at all times. It is an opportunity to tell people about the parks. During the breaks there is a rush of people. It will probably be necessary to have two people – one to do the books and someone else to tell about the parks. People spend a lot of time there. It's not just an opportunity for the vendors to sell merchandise; many amateur historians look forward to this event and go several hours early on Thursday so they can spend time and get a first crack at some of those items they can't find anywhere

else.

Chairman Stewart called for a recess at 10:32 a.m.

Chairman Stewart reconvened the meeting at 10:51 a.m.

3. Strategic Plan/Board Input

Chairman Stewart noted that in the past the Strategic Plan was presented in July and it was pretty much done. Last year Mr. Siegwarth worked hard to get a draft to the Board in May and the Board was able to discuss it and make some changes. This year she felt it would be helpful if there was an opportunity for Board input. This will not be a discussion between the Board and staff. It is more of an opportunity for the Board to say what is important to them, directions the Board should be going, and things the Board should be doing that they would like staff to try to work into the Strategic Plan. The Board does not want staff to react to what is said today in order to give them more time to think about it. Staff can come back to the Board over the next two meetings and discuss what can be worked into the Strategic Plan and what things are already being done or cannot work. This discussion is to be open ended for the Board to say what they think should be done or what they would like to see in the Strategic Plan that hasn't been there.

Mr. Porter stated that he likes the way the Strategic Plan is put together, but he also hates it. It makes sense once one has worked through it; but it is also very hard to get a cohesive picture of where it is and what it will do. He would like to see an opening section that gives a very cryptic and less textural summary, almost like a bullet summary, of the key elements and items – especially anything that is changing or being transitioned. One almost has to read the whole document, digest it, and then go back and try to put a cohesive picture together.

Mr. Porter noted that the Strategic Plan is so rich in information, data, analysis, and detail – as it should be – but he finds the big picture missing that points one to what should be looked for while going through it.

Mr. Porter added that he has not been happy from the time he came on this Board with the way new Board members are educated. They are not educated. New Board members learn as they go by osmosis. He believes a serious look needs to be taken in that regard. Board members come on for a term of six years, or shorter if filling a vacancy. He hates to see new Board members lose the first year-and-a-half on the Board trying to figure out the acronyms. He would like to see a sort of college set up – a two-day period – where a new Board member would come to Phoenix and spend two days being given a thorough briefing section-by-section and a listing of the common acronyms and descriptions. He congratulated Mr. Travous on this latest round of graphs dealing with the finances. It probably sets forth better than anything he has seen so far in helping to understand the financial and funding issues. He has never seen such a complicated Machiavellian mess in his life as this organization. It is not something the agency or Board created. It was created step-by-step by the legislature and other agencies we have to deal with. Just to start with, an explanation needs to be given to new Board members as to why the Board doesn't just run state parks and that the organization has been a catch-all dumping ground for the legislature for the past 20 years. Anything new that came along that they didn't know where to put they dumped under ASP. The Board was finally able to rid itself of the grazing allotments. Most people think that ASP runs state parks. They don't understand the agency operates trails, has responsibility for off-highway vehicles, has responsibility for safety on the lakes, monitors millions of dollars in grants, etc. Logic would say that SHPO would not be under ASP. One would think it would fall under the AHS.

Ms. Chilton noted that she had written grants for the Heritage Fund and knew that ASP had that responsibility. She knew about the responsibility the agency has on the lakes because the Sheriff's Office in Gila County received grants. She knew about the partnerships because she had worked

with SRP. She was on Planning and Zoning for 18 years and ran for public office so she knew about ASP from that experience as well.

Mr. Porter stated that he would like to look at some kind of organized orientation for new Board members. A senior Board member may be useful as a mentor to assist in that process. He would be very pleased to come in and assist in that process. He believes that goes hand-in-hand with the new Vision statement. If we are going to be the best at what we do, it would include having a board that is well-informed, well-educated, and well-trained. He noted that Mr. Travous was extremely kind when he first joined the Board. He was able to come to the Phoenix office, sit down, talk, and go over some things. While he learned a lot, it wasn't nearly enough. In retrospect, he now knows he did not get what he should have gotten from that time. He could have been more effective earlier if he had had formal orientation.

Ms. Chilton asked if the agency has orientation for new employees.

Mr. Travous responded affirmatively.

Ms. Chilton asked if there is a glossary available with acronyms.

Mr. Travous responded that the orientation is more tied to entry-level positions and they don't necessarily see the acronyms because it is the bureaucracy in Phoenix.

Mr. Porter asked that staff give it some thought. He would like staff to come up with some sort of summary that would guide one through the Strategic Plan. That document is very intimidating the first time one sees it. He's not sure he understood its purpose the first time he saw it. He knew what a strategic plan was, but he's not sure he related it to that document. It took a while for him to understand it. It's still somewhat intimidating.

Chairman Stewart stated that, even with a good background in state government and having been to a lot of the parks and having been involved in grants peripherally, it was a pretty big learning curve.

Mr. Travous noted that acronyms are being added all the time.

Ms. Chilton agreed that an orientation would be great for new Board members.

Chairman Stewart stated that she has been concerned ever since she's been on the Board that the beginning of the Strategic Plan always reads well; it has a nice introduction; but when one looks at what is really going to be done and how effectiveness is to be measured, the performance measures don't really show what we are as an agency. Her favorite is where it talks about preserving open space and we do a survey of what other people in the state have done to preserve open space. With the new Vision, she feels strongly that there should be things in the Strategic Plan that relate to what the Board sees the agency being.

Chairman Stewart stated that she would like to see a number of things included in the Strategic Plan. She would like to see the agency move toward using more sustainable building materials and get into green building. This is not something on-the-edge any more. Major corporations are doing this because they have found it to be cost-effective; it decreases energy consumption; it decreases water consumption; and the impact on the environment is less.

Chairman Stewart stated that when doing development projects it is imperative to look first at what the impact on the environment or resource is, whether it's a cultural resource or a natural resource. We need to begin thinking in terms of bringing in SHPO and the Natural Resources section on the front end. Many times she's heard that things were held up because they didn't get approval from SHPO or there was some other problem. If we are really focusing on the resources, that comes first. When anyone first starts talking about something, the Natural Resources section and SHPO need to be brought into the development discussions so that they are a part of the planning and can point out if there will be an impact or make suggestions of better materials to use or places where the

development could take place where the impact would be less and blend in better.

Chairman Stewart noted that the AZ Dept. of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) have a green building. This is something that people come to tour. Game & Fish has used sustainable building materials in one of their buildings. These could be demonstration projects. There are grants for those things. It would also be something the public would find as an added dimension. They would be interested in learning about it. It would be educational.

Chairman Stewart added that, along those lines, it also seems that the agency could be doing more exciting designs and bring in architectural design students from ASU or UA and have a contest to design a new format for a ramada or rest rooms or visitors center – something that is interesting and blends in with the environment. Tempe had contests for bus stops. They got a lot of neat bus stops as a result of that effort and people feel connected to those things. We could have our specifications in terms of what the agency needs, but there might be a way to do it where the public gets part of it and it doesn't cost any more to do it that way.

Chairman Stewart stated that she would also like to see the agency focus on marketing to young Arizona residents 18-35 years old – not just families but single people. She noticed that she reads a couple editions of college news and other kinds of printed material. There was an article in one of them written by a student about touring KCSP with her family and another article about someone who had visited Tonto Natural Bridge State Park. Young people are excited about these things. A lot of people are looking for a challenge. A lot of our parks offer challenge or unique sites. Mr. Beechum said that if people don't go to parks when they are young they don't think about going to them later in life. The Board talked about getting school-aged children to the parks and the agency is doing things in that regard. There really has not been any thought given to the people a bit beyond school who are still looking for activities.

Chairman Stewart stated that the agency should also consider some cooperative marketing with counties, cities, and national parks. People who are already out at parks are interested in learning about other parks. She always looks to see what information is available on other places nearby when she is visiting national parks or monuments or municipal parks. There was talk by Maricopa Parks and Recreation about perhaps having kiosks at some of their parks. People who are hiking are always looking for another place to go. The Board has some dynamite places. She believes the agency has done a good job on, and perhaps even overdone, the marketing to the RVers and out-of-state people. In order to have decent budgets in the future we need to start working on Arizona residents.

Ms. Chilton noted that she sits on the Private Tourism Board for the Tribe. They are working with Tonto Natural Bridge State Park for a group to stay there and tour the park. This is an in-state tourism function.

Mr. Porter noted that a spin-off for PAMS could very easily be the ability to create some interesting traveling exhibits on different state parks that could be placed, for example, in banks. Banks are always looking for interesting displays. A few years ago Bank One got excited about a project that was being done on a high school level where children were encouraged to construct replicas of historic buildings all over the state. Bank One in downtown Phoenix had a display of a small town of these historic buildings in Arizona done by high school students. The History Convention displayed that exhibit after Bank One was done with it. It would be possible to put traveling exhibits together relating to state parks for display at high schools to encourage an interest in state parks whether it be the physical park, the health park, the historic or cultural park, etc. He believes the agency is missing a good marketing ploy by not trying to tap into some of those entities at an early point.

Mr. Porter noted that there are 132 museums around the state that are always looking for interesting new temporary displays. If offered some sort of display, especially on the historic parks, they would

probably jump at the opportunity to have a temporary display for 3-5 months. The museum in Kingman has a marvelous temporary display hall; they are always looking for something new and interesting. They would be tickled pink to have a six-month long display on ASP there. Hospitals would be another great venue. Places where people spend time are always looking for something to give people to look at to help relax them in tense situations. A lot of hospitals will have historic displays. He believes this is part of the strategic plan. Being the best at what we do means being best-known. The better known we are the more effective we are. This is an area we've been missing that would probably not even require a huge amount of capital input.

Chairman Stewart suggested this is something the Board can discuss in its meeting with AHS. Not only does the Board want to send out its information, but in order to make people come to the parks we need to get new material in. If there are exhibits that our visitors would be interested in, perhaps they could be brought in.

Mr. Porter added that a permanent rotation of exhibits from ASP ought to be in all four of AHS's primary museums. As a member of that board, he can say that they would be delighted to work something like that out whereby they would always have some kind of display in those museums on a temporary basis dealing with one or more the state parks. In turn, there should be a mini display relating to AHS and its museums in all of the Board's historic parks. When people visit one of ASP's historic parks there should be something to encourage them to visit AHS's museums. Conversely, everyone who visits one of those museums needs to leave aware of the Board's historic properties.

Chairman Stewart stated that she would like to see the creation of a state heritage area program. SHPO has been conducting sessions at their historic preservation conference about the benefits of these programs. She saw it firsthand in northern Utah and southern Idaho. The national heritage area program is complicated to get into and the money is drying up. Simply creating a statewide program helps get more grant money and ties together the recreational, cultural, and historical resources in an area. The agency could take a leadership role and, with very little money, help communities plan their heritage areas. It may be possible to change the grant programs whereby an extra number of points could be given to applicants who were part of one of those state heritage areas. It would provide an incentive and the parks would be part of some of these heritage areas. It's a nice way to give visitors a sense of what an area is really all about. She believes it would be worth further exploration.

Chairman Stewart stated that as the Board is changing its Vision and getting more involved in resource management, a lot of expertise is being developed that can be shared with cities and counties. Perhaps a program can be set up to provide consulting services, free in the beginning with a later fee to defer the cost of the salary. It would create more partnerships and give the agency a leadership role while providing the opportunity to recoup some costs. Without doing that now, it seems that some of the Growing Smarter money could be used to provide some workshops on regional planning, stewardship of land once it's acquired, and resource management. Part of the Growing Smarter process is getting the land trusts, cities, and counties able to purchase State Trust land. They can't just walk in and buy it; they have to be organizationally strong. The Board has to be sure they will take good care of the land and that they know how to do it and that they are working together with others. That may be something we can move into without adding staff.

Chairman Stewart noted that there are things in the existing plan regarding identifying and planning to acquire open space to protect existing properties. This is an ongoing evaluation that the Board needs to focus on.

Chairman Stewart stated that her last item is that the Board try to ensure that the grants it awards in LWCF and the Local Regional and State Parks (LRSP) are more consistent with what the public have said in the SCORP they are interested in. There is a disconnect between what is awarded and

what people have said they want. It may not be an issue of changing the criteria so much as perhaps changing some of the examples in the grant manuals and promoting open space, trails, and preserve areas to potential applicants. For some reason the Board does not receive applications for the things that the public say they want.

Mr. Travous noted that staff are planning a scoping process. This information will be taken back and be put through a formal process. Staff will have a presentation for the Board on the scoping process at the April meeting.

Chairman Stewart stated that she had an additional item for consideration. She suggested coming up with a way to increase the interpretation programs at parks other than KCSP, Red Rock, and Oracle where staff do an excellent job. She is not sure how much interpretation has been done at the other parks – both recreational and historic – to enhance the visitor’s experience whether it is done through volunteers or staff, whether it is done orally or sited. There are a number of ways it can be done. In our efforts to do all of the other things that need to be done, this seems to be the first thing to go and yet it that’s what makes the visitor experience so meaningful.

Mr. Porter added that, regarding his example of trying to market ourselves in, say, the schools, there are two avenues open that could be very comfortably partnered with and piggybacked on. AHS has a traveling trunk program that goes to the schools on a variety of different topics dealing with Arizona history. It strikes him that the agency could incorporate elements of some of the state parks that fit in to that picture that could be incorporated into their trunks. The agency could put together its own tagalongs to go out to the schools. The other big avenue is History Day. The History Day organization has become institutionalized in the history departments of the schools across the state. They have credibility. The History Convention now uses them for publicity and prizes. The agency may be able to use History Day’s contacts to get its traveling exhibits into those schools as a part of their process each year. For a period of a month to six weeks they play a major role in the history sections of the school systems.

Chairman Stewart suggested having an ASP prize for the best paper written on a state park or a subject relating to a state park that could be a weekend at a cabin or a tour for six at KCSP plus an Annual Pass.

Mr. Porter stated that he did not doubt that there would be entities out there who would happily fund a cash prize. It would be good publicity for ASP.

4. Possible Foundation Projects

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board received as list of possible Foundation projects in their packet.

Chairman Stewart stated that it occurred to her that the Board probably needs more meat in some of the areas on the list. She wasn’t clear as to whether the House of Apache Fire referred to repairing it or building a new House of Apache Fire. She feels there is a need for more detail.

Mr. Porter asked if the Foundation is looking to the Board to tell them which of the items on the list are the hot button items it would really like.

Ms. Statler responded that the Foundation would probably like to see a list of those that the Board endorses. She believes that the Foundation’s goals and strategic plan will address many of them. Some of the items discussed today are already part of this list, such as Verde Valley Greenway, Sonoita Creek, etc. Other items mentioned today such as the traveling exhibits that would provide an opportunity for the Foundation to partner with volunteers in the organization. The Foundation is as much a marketing arm of the agency as fundraising. She believes it is their job to tell the story. They cannot help but do that as they solicit donations.

Ms. Statler stated that a contest prize would be something the Foundation could do very easily. The

Foundation has an opportunity to make selections from the list. They would want to see a pared down version that the Board says it would like while keeping in mind that everything on the list is vital.

Ms. Statler noted that the Foundation expects to add two new members to its board. One is from Tucson, has strategic planning background, and lives near Catalina State Park. He may have a very keen interest and constituency of his own that may want to just embrace and adopt a particular campaign. That is what the Foundation is working to do – establish and take these things on not just as a Foundation board but as a much larger network of friends organizations they partner with. There are many opportunities to address this list with potential partnerships. She sees this list as a jumping off point that couldn't have been presented in a better timing situation. The Foundation is just introducing itself to the state of Arizona through receptions such as that held last week. There is another event on the May 1st at Oracle State Park. They expect to conduct another event in Northern Arizona over the summer. It is important to relay to the public attending the Foundation's events that the Foundation is sinking its teeth into these selected projects, they are enthused about them, and they are important to the park system. They are as much a fundraising tool for the Foundation as they are awareness-building opportunities for ASP.

Ms. Statler noted that she is maintaining a guest list for the May 1 Foundation event and welcomed any input the Board may have to that list. The Foundation is eager to host and promote events. People such as Luther Propst, Guy Tobin, and Dennis Getman should be included on the guest list for this event.

Ms. Statler stated that the Foundation's board would be enthusiastic to receive an endorsement of some sort of the list of possible projects.

Chairman Stewart noted that three things would be helpful for the Board to provide that endorsement. She noted that Boyce Thompson Arboretum did a super job with getting people to purchase things. They have a list that tells people what they need that is more specific than this list and has dollar amounts included. She believes the Foundation will be more successful with a list that provides more information.

Chairman Stewart stated that the Board pretty much will need to wait until a contract with the Foundation is signed before it can approve a list. Approval of a list before there is a signed contract makes the Foundation the Board's agent to raise funds for those items. The Board probably needs to get the list back next month.

Ms. Statler responded that the Foundation's board will meet prior to the next Board meeting. She expects that there will be a revised list available.

Chairman Stewart noted that she is concerned with including things on a list that deal with major building projects and acquisitions of property. If there is a major fund raising effort for a specific item and for some reason the Board cannot follow through with that project or acquisition, lawsuits could be filed and demands made for the return of that money. She is concerned with listing specific property, especially Sonoita Creek, until the Board knows whether it will be able to go forward. There have been a number of things raised in the last few meetings relating to water issues and other concerns. The Board could be getting itself into difficulty if something like that were included on the list at this point. An item such as acquisition of land for extending existing state parks or protecting view sheds might not get people excited enough to donate money. She is concerned with Sonoita Creek appearing on that list because there have been some fairly major issues raised recently. She is concerned with leaving it on the list until the Board knows whether it will be able to proceed with that project.

Mr. Travous responded that this is a list of items that are of mutual interest. The Foundation's own

rules say that they won't pursue anything unless they have written approval from the Executive Director of the agency.

Chairman Stewart stated her discomfort voting for this list knowing what she knows now in terms of major hurdles that would need to be overcome before this property could appear on a list.

Ms. Statler noted that this is a living list. It will evolve. The property could certainly be removed and added later. The specific mention here is the visitors center.

Mr. Travous noted that the Foundation is so young that he does not see where they have the prowess at this juncture to do those types of things.

Mr. Porter stated that he would like the Foundation come up with two or three fairly modest projects that they feel they could concentrate on and make specific headway on that would then, in turn, give it credibility as an entity. They will have more credibility if they can point to successful projects. They would have more credibility with him if they can demonstrate to him by what they have already done that if he gives them funding they will really be able to make something happen, whether it's a generic or a specific project.

Mr. Porter added that, should he become Chairman of the Board next year, his pet project will be San Rafael. He sees that property as one of the most exciting potential future areas for expansion of the park system with a property the Board already owns. He sees it as an opportunity to do some unique things such as perhaps someday having a functioning ranch where people can get an experience in seeing an actual ranching operation the way it was run in the beginning. He was pleased to see items on the Foundation's list that relate to San Rafael. Perhaps there is something down there the Foundation could look at to start pushing for.

Ms. Statler responded that there are some Foundation board members who are clearly passionate about adopting some projects that would have an impact on the agency's ability to open that park.

Chairman Stewart asked if it would be helpful for the Foundation to come back to the Board with projects highlighted that they feel they can do.

Ms. Hernbrode clarified the process as it stands now. ASP will create a list of things the agency would like and give it to the Foundation. The Foundation will come back with those things they want to do and concentrate on.

Mr. Travous explained that this is the list that staff created and are giving to both the Board and the Foundation.

Chairman Stewart stated that it would be easier for her to come up with her priorities if she had a better idea of what staff wanted to do and a ballpark price range. She agrees that the Foundation should be suggesting projects that are doable soon so that they can obtain credibility. Obviously, the Board does not want to get in the middle of some big thing that the Foundation does not have the capacity to accomplish at this point.

Mr. Porter stated that he would like staff to refine the list a little more and prioritize staff's wish list. Staff have a better idea of what's out there and what could really help the most as well as those items that will not get done in the near future. He would like to see a shorter list of perhaps 10-12 items that staff view as potentially doable and provide more information. Perhaps at the next meeting the Board could go through that list and give its input as to whether or not the Board's prioritization is the same.

Mr. Hays asked if this list is prioritized or random.

Mr. Travous responded that it is not prioritized.

Mr. Hays noted that the first six or seven are things there wouldn't be in any conflict on bargaining

for acquisitions with the possible exception of Verde River. They are things the Board already owns. McFarland, particularly, needs attention as quickly as possible.

Chairman Stewart stated that she would like to see one of the early projects be some kind of help with a traveling exhibit. That would tie in with helping with marketing. The Foundation will be out in the community. Sometimes there can be more than one copy of the same exhibit. Once an exhibit has been designed and the initial work is done, it doesn't cost much more to duplicate it.

Mr. Porter added that there could be a display of, say, Ft. Verde at Jerome. It would pique the interest of visitors to that historic park to go down the road to another park that might be just as interesting. The idea is to get people aware of what the Board has and pique their interest. If they demonstrated an interest at one park, they are likely to have an interest in a nearby similar park if they are aware of it. These are prime targets for marketing.

Ms. Chilton asked if the Foundation is eligible to seek grants to help in their fundraising efforts.

Ms. Statler responded that the Foundation could certainly apply for grants.

Mr. Ream noted this list does not include a lot of infrastructure because those types of things are not easy to raise money for. People do not get excited about septic systems and wastewater systems.

Mr. Porter stated that he would like to see staff take the list back, prioritize it, add information to it, let the Foundation review it, let the Board review it, and from that a list should be possible that everyone can agree to.

Chairman Stewart stated that there are two things to keep in mind. The Board obviously wants to have something that is geographically balanced so there are things in different parts of the state. Some people are not interested in things that are too far away. In addition, with the agency's anniversary coming up and the fact that a lot of the historic parks will be showcased, it seems that exhibits are a pretty critical issue at a lot of those parks. Some of the parks, other than McFarland, would not be as costly because there may not be as much needed to be done. McFarland is, however, at the top in terms of need. Exhibits can be broken up. People are probably more interested in contributing to an exhibit at a specific state park than simply contributing to exhibits.

Mr. Porter noted that he was intrigued by the item "Wyatt Earp's Gun". He asked for more information.

Mr. Travous responded that if one were to do something at Tombstone that is the epitome of Western justice, it would be acquiring Wyatt Earp's gun. It is known to exist.

Chairman Stewart noted that Wyatt Earp's rifle is held by AHS. The agency cannot acquire it because of the lack of adequate security.

Mr. Travous noted that the pistol is in Boston. The Tombstone Restoration Committee has a quarter of a million dollars in their bank. If they wanted to do something for Tombstone, acquiring that pistol and upgrading security at the park would be those things. The pistol was available for sale several years ago for \$200,000.

Mr. Porter suggested that might be something that would be doable for the Foundation. It would be rather dramatic. With the anniversary coming up, that might be something that would provide a high profile project that could put the Foundation on the map in Arizona as an entity. Once there is mention of the Earps and the OK Corral, it becomes "bread and potatoes" stuff in Arizona. Even newcomers' ears perk up. It caught his attention.

Mr. Travous noted that Tennessee celebrated its 50th anniversary 10-15 years ago. They had Andrew Jackson's sword displayed. They even allowed themselves to cut the anniversary cake with Andrew Jackson's sword.

Mr. Porter noted that Wyatt Earp's pistol immediately caught his attention. All it says is "Wyatt Earp's Pistol". It made him wonder what about the pistol, where is it, do we have it, can we get it, what would we do with it, etc. Of all the things listed on that list, that would probably open his pocketbook for a contribution to the Foundation the quickest.

Mr. Travous noted that some of the items on the list are simple. For example, the "Cowboy Legacies" would be an event where the ranching industry in Arizona is highlighted. "Mine, All Mine" would highlight mining and the impact of mines in Arizona. He was told last year that Hollywood has run out of good footage for cattle drives in movies. All the big cattle drive footage they had was shot by John Ford in the 1950s and 1960s. If they could put together a cattle drive across a large ranch with different kinds of cattle and generic cowboys shot from various angles they would have stock footage for westerns for the next 50 years.

Ms. Chilton noted that Texas was looking for cowboys to do a PBS special on ranching in Texas. They are advertising in California and Arizona for cowboys. She wondered why we couldn't do something like that for PBS.

Mr. Travous noted that some of the items listed are already going on, such as Bat Days (KCSP) and Salsa Days (Colorado River Parks).

Mr. Porter noted that there are 14 exhibits listed for 14 different parks. It seems to him that the first step could be these traveling exhibits – mini mock-ups of the real exhibits. They could be in banks, in schools, AHS museums, special events, History Conventions, and other state parks. The agency could generate tremendous traffic from them, all the while touting the Foundation and plans for permanent exhibits. The Foundation could begin to put itself on the map just by that process and help the Board and agency tremendously by publicizing who and what we are.

Mr. Porter added that when he came on the Board he had no idea of Slide Rock State Park's historic value. He thought of Slide Rock as a fun water park. He had no inkling that Slide Rock had the important history element that is there. He feels the agency does itself a disservice by not doing a better job of advertising some of the various aspects of the parks that could increase visitation if people were just aware of them.

Chairman Stewart stated that there was no need for Executive Session.

G. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

All public who were present to speak had already done so.

H. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chairman Stewart stated that the next Board meeting will be held in Flagstaff on April 21, 2005. It is important that Board members try to come Wednesday. At about 3:30 p.m. there will be a tour of some of the properties in the Verde Valley Greenway, followed by a tour of Jerome around 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Travous noted that the Chairman of the Hopi Tribe has requested to speak at the April meeting. The Sedona Fire District has also requested time on the Agenda in April. Staff will present the results of the Strategic Plan scoping process at that meeting.

Chairman Stewart requested the report on the implementation of the new Vision. The AHS delegation will meet with the Board at the April meeting. The Acquisition Priorities list will be on the Agenda. She requested a brief update on State Trust Land from Mr. Winkleman as well as beginning a dialogue as to what the Board can do about some of those properties.

Ms. Hernbrode stated that she anticipated a report on the Mabery litigation issue. There will be a Hearing April 1. She noted that she will not be at the April meeting and that Ms. Patricia Boland will attend in her place. She anticipates the need for a discussion on a Conflict Waiver because her father

is expected to be confirmed as a Game & Fish Commissioner. She prefers that discussion take place when she is not present.

Chairman Stewart requested a preliminary written report on the Mabery litigation issue.

Mr. Porter noted that he will not be able to attend the May 18-19 Board.

Chairman Stewart suggested delaying the meeting by one week to May 25-26. Mr. Travous will speak with absent Board members to see whether or not they will be able to attend a Board meeting on May 25-26. Chairman Stewart, Mr. Porter, Ms. Chilton, and Mr. Hays can attend a Board meeting May 25-26.

I. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Porter made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Chilton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously and Chairman Stewart adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

J. TOUR OF TUBAC PRESIDIO STATE HISTORIC PARK

Some Board members participated in a tour of the park following Adjournment of the Board meeting. No business was conducted.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

SUBMITTED BY:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

APPROVED BY:

Elizabeth Stewart, Chairman